

3

very rare 1876

A  
DISSERTATION  
ON  
THE THREE PARTS  
OF  
KING HENRY VI.

TENDING TO SHEW  
THAT THOSE PLAYS WERE NOT WRITTEN  
ORIGINALLY  
*BY SHAKSPEARE.*

---

BY EDMOND MALONE, Esq.

---

*Aut videt aut vidisse putat per nubila lunam. VIRG.*

---

LONDON:  
FROM THE PRESS OF HENRY BALDWIN.  
MDCCCLXXXVII.

DISSERTATION

THE THREE PARTS

OF

KING HENRY VI.

ATTEMPTING TO SHOW

THAT THOSE PLAYS WERE NOT WRITTEN

BY SHAKESPEARE

BY THOMAS LONE, ESQ.



BY THOMAS LONE, ESQ.

AND MAY BE SEEN AT THE BODLEIAN MUSEUM.

LONDON

PRINTED BY J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

MDCCLXXXII.

---

## THE CONTENTS.

THE subject stated. The inferior parts in these three plays being of a different complexion from the inferior parts of Shakspeare's undoubted performances; a proof that they were not written *originally* and *entirely* by him; p. 3.—The editor's hypothesis: *The First Part of K. Henry VI.* not written by Shakspeare, of a very small part of it written by him. *The Second and Third Part of K. Henry VI.* formed by Shakspeare on two elder plays, the one entitled *The first part of the Contention of the two famous houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good duke Humphrey, &c.* the other, *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixth.* p. 4.

### THE FIRST PART OF K. HENRY VI.

The diction, versification, and allusions, of this piece all different from the diction, versification, and allusions of Shakspeare, and corresponding with those of the dramatists that preceded him; p. 5—12. Date of this play some years before 1592; p. 12. Other internal evidence (beside the diction, &c.) that this piece was not written by Shakspeare; not by the authour of *The first part of the Contention of the two houses, &c.* nor by the authour of *The true tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke*; p. 13—15. Presumptive proof that this play was not written by Shakspeare, from its not containing any similarities of thought to his undisputed plays; nor of expression, (except in a single instance,) and from its general paucity of rhymes, p. 16.

### THE SECOND AND THIRD PART OF K. HENRY VI.

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE. 1. The entry of *The first part of the Contention of the two houses, &c.* at Stationers' Hall in  
1594.

## C O N T E N T S.

1394, *anonymous*. 2. That piece, and *The true tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke*, printed in 1600, *anonymously*. Shakspeare's name afterwards fraudulently affixed to these pieces, and why. The same artifice practised with respect to other plays on which he had constructed dramas, p. 17—18. 3. These two old plays performed by Lord Pembroke's Servants, by whom *Titus Andronicus*, and *The old Taming of a Shrew* were performed, and by whom not one of Shakspeare's undisputed plays were represented, p. 19. 4. Reasons assigned for supposing Robert Greene, or George Peele, or both, the authour or authours of the old plays, p. 19—20. These pieces *new-modelled* and *re-written* by Shakspeare, with great additions, which in the present edition are distinguished by a peculiar mark, p. 21. The mode taken by Shakspeare, p. 21—25. 6. The fraud of Pavier the bookseller, who in the year 1619, after the death of Shakspeare, affixed his name to these two old plays, accounted for, p. 26—27. 7. These two old pieces being printed and reprinted, and *The first part of K. Henry VI.* not being printed, in Shakspeare's life time, a presumptive proof that he new-modelled the former, and had little or no concern with the latter, p. 28.

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE. 1. The VARIATIONS between the two old plays in quarto, and the corresponding pieces in the folio edition of our authour's dramatick works, of so peculiar a nature, as to mark *two distinct hands*. Several passages and circumstances found in the old plays, of which there is no trace in Shakspeare's new modification of them; others materially varying. These insertions and variations could not have arisen from unskilful copyists or shorthandwriters, who sometimes curtail and mutilate, but do not invent and amplify, p. 28—33. 2. The RESEMBLANCES between certain passages in Shakspeare's *Second and Third Part of K. Henry VI.* and his undisputed works, a proof that he wrote a large portion of those plays; and 3. the DISCORDANCIES between them and his undisputed plays, a proof that he did not write the whole; these resemblances being



## C O N T E N T S.

found *only* in the folio, that is, in the plays as new-modelled by Shakspeare; and these discordancies being found in the old quarto plays, from whence it must be presumed that they were adopted through carelessness or haste, p. 34.—37.

4. The peculiar INACCURACIES of Shakspeare; and 5. his peculiar PHRASEOLOGY, which are found in *The Second and Third Part of K. Henry VI.* as exhibited in folio, and not in the old quarto plays printed in 1600, prove that there were two distinct hands in these pieces; p. 38—39. So also do, 6. the TRANSPOSITIONS, p. 40; and 7. the REPETITIONS, p. 41; and 8. the INCONSISTENCIES arising from sometimes following, and sometimes departing from, an original model, p. 42. 9. Hall the historian on whose Chronicle the anonymous plays in quarto were constructed, but Holinshed and not Hall, Shakspeare's historian, p. 43—44.

The old plays on which Shakspeare formed his *Second and Third Parts of K. Henry VI.* probably written by the authour of *King John*, printed in 1591, whoever he was; p. 45. An attempt made to account for *The First Part of K. Henry VI.* being printed in the first folio edition of our poet's dramatick works, p. 46. Objections of Dr. Johnson and others, enumerated. Recapitulation, p. 47. A considerable part of the English history dramatized before the time of Shakspeare; and many of his historical and other plays formed on those of preceding writers. Conclusion, p. 48—51.

---

## E R R A T A.

Page 16, l. *penult.* of note, for *undoubted* r. *undated*.

Page 43, l. 21, for 40, r. 459.

A D I S S E R -



---

A  
D I S S E R T A T I O N  
O N  
THE THREE PARTS  
O F  
K I N G   H E N R Y   V I.

T E N D I N G   T O   S H E W

That those Plays were *not* written ORIGINALLY by  
S H A K S P E A R E.

SEVERAL passages in *The Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.* appearing evidently to be of the hand of Shakspeare, I was long of opinion that the *three* historical dramas which are the subject of the present disquisition, were properly ascribed to him; not then doubting that the whole of these plays was the production of the same person. But a more minute investigation of the subject, into which I have been led by the present revision of all our author's works, has convinced me, that, though the premises were true, my conclusion was too hastily drawn; for though the hand of Shakspeare is unquestionably found in the two latter of these plays, it does not therefore necessarily follow, that they were *originally* and *entirely* composed by him. My thoughts upon this point have already been intimated in the foregoing notes; but it is now necessary for me to state my opinion more particularly, and to lay before the reader the grounds on which, after a very careful inquiry, it has been formed.

What at present I have chiefly in view is, to account for the visible *inequality* in these pieces; many traits of Shakspeare being clearly discernible in them, while the  
A inferior

inferior parts are not merely unequal to the rest, (from which no certain conclusion can be drawn,) but of quite a different complexion from the inferior parts of our author's undoubted performances.

My hypothesis then is, that *The First Part of K. Henry VI.* as it now appears, (of which no quarto copy is extant,) was the entire or nearly the entire production of some ancient dramatist; that *The Whole Contention of the two Houses of York and Lancaster, &c.* written probably before the year 1590, and printed in quarto, in 1600, was also the composition of some writer who preceded Shakspeare; and that from this piece, which is in two parts, (the former of which is entitled, *The first Part of the Contention of the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good duke Humphrey, &c.* and the latter, *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixth,*) our poet formed the two plays, entitled *The Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI.* as they appear in the first folio edition of his works.

Mr. Upton has asked, "How does the painter distinguish copies from originals but by manner and style? And have not authors their peculiar style and manner, from which a true critick can form as unerring a judgment as a painter?" Dr. Johnson, though he has shewn, with his usual acuteness, that "this illustration of the critick's science will not prove what is desired," acknowledges in a preceding note, that "dissimilitude of style and heterogeneousness of sentiment may sufficiently shew that a work does not really belong to the reputed author. But in these plays (he adds) no such marks of spuriousness are found. The diction, the versification, and the figures, are Shakspeare's."—By these criterions then let us examine *The First Part of K. Henry VI.* (for I choose to consider that piece separately;) and if the diction, the figures, or rather the allusions, and the versification of that play, (for these are our surest guides) shall appear to be different from the other two parts, as they are exhibited in the folio, and from our author's other plays, we may fairly conclude that he was not the writer of it.

I. With



## KING HENRY VI.

§

I. With respect to the diction and the allusions, which I shall consider under the same head, it is very observable that in *The First Part of King Henry VI.* there are more allusions to mythology, to classical authors, and to ancient and modern history, than, I believe, can be found in any one piece of our author's written on an English story; and that these allusions are introduced very much in the same manner as they are introduced in the plays of Greene, Peele, Lodge, and other dramatists who preceded Shakspeare; that is, they do not naturally arise out of the subject, but seem to be inserted merely to shew the writer's learning. Of these the following are the most remarkable.

1. Mars his true moving, even as in the heavens,  
So in the earth, to this day is not known.
2. A far more glorious star thy soul will make  
Than Julius Cæsar, or bright—

This blank, Dr. Johnson with the highest probability conjectures, should be filled up with "Berenice;" a word that the transcriber or compositor probably could not make out. In the same manner he left a blank in a subsequent passage for the name of "Nero," as is indubitably proved by the following line, which ascertains the omitted word. See N<sup>o</sup>. 6.

3. Was Mahomet inspired with a dove?
4. Helen, the mother of Great Constantine,  
Nor yet Saint Philip's daughters, were like thee.
5. Froisard, a countryman of ours, records, &c.
6. ——— and, like thee, [Nero,]

Play on the lute, beholding the towns burning.

[In the original copy there is a blank where the word *Nero* is now placed.]

7. The spirit of deep prophecy she hath,  
Exceeding the nine Sybils of old Rome.
8. A witch, by fear, not force, like Hannibal,  
Drives back our troops—.
9. Divinest creature, Astræa's daughter—.
10. ——— Adonis' gardens,  
That one day bloom'd, and fruitful were the next.



11. A statelier pyramis to her I'll rear,  
Than Rhodope's, or Memphis', ever was.
12. ——— an urn more precious  
Than the rich-jewel'd coffer of Darius.
13. I shall as famous be by this exploit,  
As Scythian Thomyris, by Cyrus' death.
14. I thought I should have seen some Hercules,  
A second Hector, for his grim aspect.
15. Nestor-like aged, in an age of care.
16. Then follow thou thy desperate fire of Crete,  
Thou Icarus.
17. Where is the great Alcides of the field?
18. Now am I like that proud insulting ship,  
That Cæsar and his fortune bare at once.
19. Is Talbot slain; the Frenchman's only scourge,  
Your kingdom's terror, and black Nemesis?
20. Thou may'st not wander in that labyrinth;  
There Minotaurs, and ugly treasons lurk.
21. See, how the ugly witch doth bend her brows,  
As if, with Circe, she would change my shape.
22. ——— thus he goes,  
As did the youthful Paris once to Greece;  
With hope to find the like event in love.

Of particular expressions there are many in this play, that seem to me more likely to have been used by the authors already named, than by Shakspeare; but I confess, with Dr. Johnson, that single words can conclude little. However, I will just mention that the words *proditor* and *immanity*, which occur in this piece, are not, I believe, found in any of Shakspeare's undisputed performances: not to insist on a direct Latinism, *pile-esteem'd*, which I am confident was the word intended by the author, though, being a word of his own formation, the compositor has printed—*pil'd-esteem'd*, instead of it<sup>1</sup>.

The versification of this play appears to me clearly of a different colour from that of all our author's genuine dramas, while at the same time it resembles that of many of the plays produced before the time of Shakspeare.

<sup>1</sup> See *K. Henry VI. P. I. p. 24, n. 7.*

# KING HENRY VI.

7

In all the tragedies written before his time, or just when he commenced author, a certain stately march of versification is very observable. The sense concludes or pauses almost uniformly at the end of every line; and the verse has scarcely ever a redundant syllable. As the reader may not have any of these pieces at hand, (by the possession of which, however, his library would not be much enriched,) I shall add a few instances,—the first that occur:

“ Most loyal lords, and faithful followers,  
 “ That have with me, unworthy general,  
 “ Passed the greedy gulph of Ocean,  
 “ Leaving the confines of fair Italy,  
 “ Behold, your Brutus draweth nigh his end,  
 “ And I must leave you, though against my will.  
 “ My sinews shrink, my numbed senses fail,  
 “ A chilling cold possesseth all my bones;  
 “ Black ugly death, with visage pale and wan,  
 “ Presents himself before my dazzled eyes,  
 “ And with his dart prepared is to strike.”

*Lochrine, 1595.*

“ My lord of Gloucester, and lord Mortimer,  
 “ To do you honour in your sovereign’s eyes,  
 “ That, as we hear, is newly come aland,  
 “ From Palestine, with all his men of war,  
 “ (The poor remainder of the royal fleet,  
 “ Preserv’d by miracle in Sicil road,)  
 “ Go mount your coursers, meet him on the way:  
 “ Pray him to spur his steed, minutes and hours,  
 “ Untill his mother see her princely son,  
 “ Shining in glory of his safe return.”

*Edward I. by George Peele, 1593.*

“ Then go thy ways, and clime up to the clouds,  
 “ And tell Apollo that Orlando sits  
 “ Making of verses for Agelica.  
 “ And if he do deny to send me down  
 “ The shirt which Deianira sent to Hercules,  
 “ To make me brave upon my wedding day,  
 “ Tell him I’ll pass the Alps, and up to Merce,

A 3

“ And

## DISSERTATION ON

“ (I know he knows that watry lakish hill)  
 “ And pull the harp out of the minstrels hands,  
 “ And pawne it unto lovely Proserpine,  
 “ That she may fetch the faire Angelica.”

*Orlando Furioso*, by Robert Greene, printed  
 in 1599; written before 1592.

“ The work that Ninus rear'd at Babylon,  
 “ The brazen walls fram'd by Semiramis,  
 “ Carv'd out like to the portal of the sunne,  
 “ Shall not be such as rings the English strand  
 “ From Dover to the market-place of Rye.”

“ To plain our questions, as Apollo did,”

“ Facile and debonaire in all his deeds,  
 “ Proportion'd as was Paris, when in gray,  
 “ He courted Oenon in the vale by Troy.”

“ Who dar'd for Edward's sake cut through the seas,  
 “ And venture as Agenor's damsel through the deepe.”

“ England's rich monarch, brave Plantagenet,  
 “ The Pyren mountains swelling above the clouds,  
 “ That ward this wealthy Castile in with walls,  
 “ Could not detain the beauteous Eleanor;  
 “ But hearing of the fame of Edward's youth,  
 “ She dar'd to brave Neptunus' haughty pride,  
 “ And brave the brunt of froward Eolus.”

“ Daphne, the damsel that caught Phœbus fast,  
 “ And lock'd him in the brightness of her looks,  
 “ Was not so beauteous in Apollo's eyes,  
 “ As is fair Margaret, to the Lincoln earl.”

“ We must lay plots for stately tragedies,  
 “ Strange comick shews, such as proud Roscius  
 “ Vaunted before the Roman emperours.”

“ Lacy, thou can'st not shrowd thy traiterous thoughts,  
 “ Nor cover, as did Cassius, all his wiles;

“ For

KING HENRY VI.

9

" For Edward hath an eye that looks as far  
" As Lynceus from the shores of Greecia."

" Pardon, my lord: If Jove's great royalty  
" Sent me such presents as to Danae;  
" If Phœbus tied to Latona's webs,  
" Came courting from the beauty of his lodge;  
" The dulcet tunes of frolick Mercurie,  
" Nor all the wealth heaven's treasury affords,  
" Should make me leave lord Lacy or his love."

" What will thou do?—  
" Shew thee the tree leav'd with refined gold,  
" Whereon the fearful dragon held his seate,  
" That watch'd the garden call'd Hesperides,  
" Subdued and wonne by conquering Hercules."

" ————— Margaret,  
" That overshines our damiels, as the moone  
" Darkens the brightest sparkles of the night."

" Should Paris enter in the courts of Greece,  
" And not lie fetter'd in fair Helen's looks?  
" Or Pœbus scape those piercing amorists,  
" That Daphne glanced at his deitie?  
" Can Edward then sit by a flame and freeze,  
" Whose heats puts Hellen and fair Daphne down?"

*The honourable Historie of Friar Bacon, &c. by Robert  
Greene; written before 1592, printed in 1598.*

" King. Thus far, ye English Peers, have we display'd  
" Our waving ensigns with a happy war;  
" Thus nearly hath our furious rage reveng'd  
" My daughter's death upon the traiterous Scot:  
" And now before Dunbar our camp is pitch'd,  
" Which if it yield not to our compromise,  
" The place shall furrow where the palace stood,  
" And fury shall envy' so high a power,  
" That mercy shall be banish'd from our sword.  
" Doug. What seeks the English king?"



## DISSERTATION ON

“ *King*. Scot, ope those gates, and let me enter in,  
 “ Submit thyself and thine unto my grace,  
 “ Or I will put each mother’s son to death,  
 “ And lay this city level with the ground.”

*James IV.* by Robert Greene, printed in  
 1598; written before 1592.

“ *Valeria*, attend; I have a lovely bride  
 “ As bright as is the heaven chrystaline;  
 “ As faire as is the milke-white way of Jove,  
 “ As chaste as Phœbe in her summer sports,  
 “ As soft and tender as the azure downe  
 “ That circles Citherea’s silver doves;  
 “ Her do I meane to make my lovely bride,  
 “ And in her bed to breathe the sweet content  
 “ That I, thou know’st, long time have aimed at.”

*The Taming of a Shrew*, written before 1594.

“ *Pol.* Faire Emilia, summers bright sun queene,  
 “ Brighter of hew than is the burning clime  
 “ Where Phœbus in his bright equator sits,  
 “ Creating gold and pretious minerals,  
 “ What would Emilia doe, if I were fond  
 “ To leave faire Athens, and to range the world?  
 “ *Emil.* Should thou assay to scale the seate of Jove,  
 “ Mounting the subtle airie regions,  
 “ Or be snatcht up, as erst was Ganimede,  
 “ Love should give wings unto my swift desires,  
 “ And prune my thoughts, that I would follow thee,  
 “ Or fall and perish as did Icarus.” *Ibid.*

“ Barons of England, and my noble lords,  
 “ Though God and fortune have bereft from us  
 “ Victorious Richard, scourge of infidels,  
 “ And clad this land in stole of dismal hue,  
 “ Yet give me leave to joy, and joy you all,  
 “ That from this wombe hath sprung a second hope,  
 “ A king that may in rule and virtue both  
 “ Succeed his brother in his emperie.”

*The troublesome raigne of King John*, 1591.

“ — as sometimes Phaeton,  
 “ Mistrusting filly Merops for his fire—.” *Ibid.*

As



KING HENRY VI.

81

"As curfed Nero with his mother did,  
"So I with you, if you refolve me not." *Ibid.*

"Peace, Arthur, peace! thy mother makes thee wings,  
"To foar with peril after Icarus." *Ibid.*

"How doth Aleſto whisper in my ears,  
"Delay not, Philip, kill the villaine ſtraight." *Ibid.*

"*Philippus atavis edite regibus,*  
"What ſaiſt thou, Philip, ſprung of ancient kings,—  
"*Quo me rapit tempeſtas?*" *Ibid.*

"Morpheus, leave here thy ſilent Ebon cave,  
"Beſiege his thoughts with diſmal phantaſies;  
"And ghafly objects of pale threatning Mors.  
"Affright him every minute with ſtern looks." *Ibid.*

"Here is the ranſome that allaies his rage,  
"The firſt freehold that Richard left his ſonne,  
"With which I ſhall ſurprize his living ſpies,  
"As Hector's ſtatue did the fainting Greeks." *Ibid.*

"This curfed country, where the traitors breathe,  
"Whoſe perjurie (as proud Briareus)  
"Beleaguers all the ſky with miſbelief." *Ibid.*

"Muſt Conſtance ſpeak? let tears prevent her talk.  
"Muſt I diſcourſe? let *Dido* ſigh, and ſay,  
"She weeps again to hear the wrack of Troy." *Ibid.*

"John, 'tis thy ſins that make it miſerable.  
"*Quicquid delirant reges, pleſtuntur Achivi.*" *Ibid.*

"*King.* Robert of Artoys, baniſh'd though thou be,  
"From France, thy native country, yet with us  
"Thou ſhalt retain as great a ſigniorie,  
"For we create thee earle of Richmond here;  
"And now go forwards with our pedigree;  
"Who next ſucceeded Philip of Bew?"

"*Art.*

- “ *Art.* Three sonnes of his, which, all successfully,  
 “ Did sit upon their father’s regal throne;  
 “ Yet died, and left no issue of their loynes.  
 “ *King.* But was my mother sister unto these?  
 “ *Art.* She was, my lord; and only Isabel  
 “ Was all the daughters that this Philip had.”

*The raigne of King Edward III.* 1596.

The tragedies of *Marius and Sylla*, by T. Lodge, 1594, *A Looking Glasse for London and England*, by T. Lodge and R. Greene, 1598, *Solyman and Perseda*, written before 1592, *Selimus Emperour of the Turks*, 1594, *The Spanish Tragedy*, 1592, and *Titus Andronicus*, will all furnish examples of a similar versification; a versification so exactly corresponding with that of *The first Part of King Henry VI.* and *The Whole Contention of the two Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, &c. as it originally appeared, that I have no doubt these plays were the production of some one or other of the authors of the pieces above quoted or enumerated.

A passage in a pamphlet written by Thomas Nashe, an intimate friend of Greene, Peele, &c. shews that *The first part of King Henry VI.* had been on the stage before 1592; and his favourable mention of this piece inclines me to believe that it was written by a friend of his. “How would it have joyed brave Talbot, (says Nashe in *Pierce Pennilesse his Supplication to the Devil*, 1592,) the terror of the French, to thinke that after he had lyen two hundred yeare in his tombe, he should triumph again on the stage; and have his bones new embalmed with the teares of ten thousand spectators at least, (at several times) who in the tragedian that represents his person behold him fresh bleeding.”

This passage was several years ago pointed out by my friend Dr. Farmer, as a proof of the hypothesis which I am now endeavouring to establish. That it related to the old play of *K. Henry VI.* or, as it is now called, *The first Part of King Henry VI.* cannot, I think, be doubted. *Talbot* appears in the *first* part, and not in the *second* or *third* part; and is expressly spoken of in the play, (as well as in *Hall’s Chronicle*) as “the terror of the French.”

Holinshed;

Holinshed, who was Shakspeare's guide, omits the passage in Hall, in which Talbot is thus described; and this is an additional proof that this play was not our author's. But of this more hereafter.

*The first part of King Henry VI.* (as it is now called) furnishes us with other *internal* proofs also of its not being the work of Shakspeare.

1. The author of that play, whoever he was, does not seem to have known precisely how old Henry the Sixth was at the time of his father's death. He opens his play indeed with the funeral of Henry the Fifth, but nowhere mentions expressly the young king's age. It is clear, however, from one passage, that he supposed him to have passed the state of infancy before he lost his father, and even to have remembered some of his sayings. In the fourth act, sc. iv. speaking of the famous Talbot, he says,

When *I* was young, (as yet I am not old,)

*I do remember how my father said,*

A stouter champion never handled sword.

But Shakspeare, as appears from two passages, one in the *second*, and the other in the *third*, part of *King Henry VI.* knew that that king could not possibly remember any thing his father had said; and therefore Shakspeare could not have been the author of the *first* part.

No sooner was I crept out of my cradle,

But I was made a king at *nine months old*.

*K. Henry VI. P. II. Act IV. sc. ix.*

When I was crown'd, I was but *nine months old*.

*K. Henry VI. P. III. Act I. sc. i.*

The first of these passages is found in the folio copy of *The second part of King Henry VI.* and not in *The first part of the Contention*, &c. printed in quarto; and according to my hypothesis, was one of Shakspeare's additions to the old play. This therefore does not prove that the *original* author, whoever he was, was not likewise the author of the *first* part of *King Henry VI.*; but, what is more material to our present question, it proves that *Shakspeare* could not be the author of that play. The *second* of these passages is found in *The true Tragedie*

*Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, &c.* and is a decisive proof that *The first part of King Henry VI.* was written neither by the author of that tragedy, nor by Shakspeare.

2. A second internal proof that Shakspeare was not the author of the *first* part of these three plays, is furnished by that scene, (Act II. sc. v. p. 48.) in which it is said, that the earl of Cambridge *raised an army* against his sovereign. But Shakspeare in his play of *K. Henry V.* has represented the matter truly as it was; the earl being in the second act of that historical piece condemned at Southampton for conspiring to *assassinate* Henry.

3. I may likewise add, that the author of *The first part of K. Henry VI.* knew the true pronounciation of the word *Hecate*, and has used it as it is used by the Roman writers :

“ I speak not to that railing *Heca-té*.”

But Shakspeare in his *Macbeth* always uses *Hecate* as a dissyllable; and therefore could not have been the author of the other piece<sup>2</sup>.

Having now, as I conceive, vindicated Shakspeare from being the writer of *The first part of King Henry VI.* it may seem unnecessary to inquire who was the author; or whether it was the production of the same person or persons who wrote the two pieces, entitled, *The first Part of the Contention of the two Houses, &c.* and *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, &c.* However, I shall add a word or two on that point.

We have already seen that the author of the play last named could not have written *The first part of K. Henry VI.* The following circumstances prove that it could not have been written by the author of *The first Part of the Contention, &c.* supposing for a moment that piece, and *The*

<sup>2</sup> It may perhaps appear a minute remark, but I cannot help observing that the second speech in this play ascertains the writer to have been very conversant with Hall's Chronicle :

“ *What should I say?* his deeds exceed all speech.”

This phrase is introduced on almost every occasion by that writer, when he means to be eloquent. Holinshed, and not Hall, was Shakspeare's historian (as has been already observed); this therefore is an additional proof that this play was not our author's.



*true Tragedie of the duke of Yorke, &c.* to have been the work of different hands.

1. The writer of *The first part of the Contention, &c.* makes Salisbury say to Richard duke of York, that the person from whom the duke derived his title, (he means his maternal uncle Edmund Mortimer, though he ignorantly gives him a different appellation, was "done to death by that monstrous rebel Owen Glendower;" and Shakspeare in this has followed him:

*Sal.* This Edmund, in the reign of Bolingbroke,  
As I have read, laid claim unto the crown;  
And, but for Owen Glendower, had been king,  
Who kept him in captivity, till he died.

On this false assertion the duke of York makes no remark. But the author of *The First Part of K. Henry VI.* has represented this Edmund Mortimer, not as put to death, or kept in captivity to the time of his death, by Owen Glendower, (who himself died in the second year of *King Henry V.*) but as a *state* prisoner, who died in the Tower in the reign of *King Henry VI.* in the presence of this very duke of York, who was then only Richard Plantagenet<sup>3</sup>.

2. A correct statement of the issue of King Edward the Third, and of the title of Edmund Mortimer to the crown, is given in *The first part of K. Henry VI.* But in *The first part of the Contention, &c.* we find a very incorrect and false statement of Edward's issue, and of the title of Mortimer, whose father, Roger Mortimer, the author of that piece ignorantly calls the *fifth son* of that monarch. Those two plays therefore could not have been the work of one hand.

On all these grounds it appears to me clear, that neither Shakspeare, nor the author of *The first part of the Contention, &c.* or *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, &c.* could have been the author of *The First Part of King Henry VI.*

It is observable that in *The Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.* many thoughts and many modes of ex-

<sup>3</sup> See the first part of *King Henry VI.* p. 49; and the second part p. 152.



pression are found, which likewise occur in Shakspeare's other dramas: but in the *First Part* I recollect but one marked expression, that is also found in one of his undisputed performances:

"As I am sick with *working of my thoughts*."

So, in *K. Henry V*:

"*Work, work your thoughts*, and therein see a siege.

But surely this is too slight a circumstance to overturn all the other arguments that have now been urged to prove this play not the production of our author. The co-incidence might be accidental, for it is a co-incidence not of thought but of language;—or the expression might have remained in his mind in consequence of his having often seen this play; (we know that he has borrowed many other expressions from preceding writers;)—or lastly, this might have been one of the very few lines that he wrote on revising this piece; which, however few they were, might, with other reasons, have induced the first publishers of his works in folio to print it with the *second* and *third* part, and to ascribe it to Shakspeare.

Before I quit this part of the subject, it may be proper to mention one other circumstance that renders it very improbable that Shakspeare should have been the author of *The First Part of K. Henry VI*. In this play, though one scene is entirely in rhyme, there are very few rhymes dispersed through the piece, and no alternate rhymes; both of which abound in our author's undisputed *early* plays. This observation indeed may likewise be extended to the *second* and *third* part of these historical dramas; and perhaps it may be urged, that if this argument has any weight, it will prove that he had no hand in the composition of those plays. But there being no alternate rhymes in those two plays may be accounted for, by recollecting that in 1591, Shakspeare had not written his *Venus and Adonis*, or his *Rape of Lucrece*; the measures of which perhaps insensibly led him to employ a similar kind of metre occasionally in the dramas that he wrote shortly after he had composed those poems. The paucity  
of

of regular rhymes must be accounted for differently. My solution is, that working up the materials which were furnished by a preceding writer, he naturally followed his mode: and in the original plays from which these two were formed very few rhymes are found. Nearly the same argument will apply to the *first* part; for its date also, were that piece Shakspeare's, would account for the want of alternate rhymes. The paucity of regular rhymes indeed cannot be accounted for by saying that here too our author was following the track of another poet; but the solution is unnecessary; for from the beginning to the end of that play, except perhaps in some scenes of the fourth act, there is not a single print of the footsteps of Shakspeare.

I have already observed that it is highly improbable that *The first Part of the Contention of the two Houses of York and Lancaster*, &c. and *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke*, &c. printed in 1600, were written by the author of *The first part of King Henry VI.* By whom these two plays were written, it is not here necessary to inquire; it is sufficient, if probable reasons can be produced for supposing this two-part piece not to have been the composition of Shakspeare, but the work of some preceding writer, on which he formed those two plays which appear in the first folio edition of his works, comprehending a period of twenty-six years. from the time of Henry's marriage to that of his death.

II. I now therefore proceed to state my opinion concerning *The Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.*

"A book entituled, *The First Part of the Contention of the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good duke Humpbrie, and the banishment and deathe of the duke of Yorke, and the tragical ende of the proude Cardinall of Winchester, with the notable rebellion of Jack Cade, and the duke of Yorke's first claime unto the crown,*" was entered at Stationers' Hall, by Thomas Millington, March 12, 1593-4. This play, however, (on which *The Second Part of King Henry VI.* is formed) was not then printed; nor was *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt, &c.*

(on which Shakspeare's *Third Part of King Henry VI.* is founded) entered at Stationers' Hall at the same time; but they were both printed for T. Millington in 1600<sup>4</sup>.

The first thing that strikes us in this entry is, that *the name of Shakspeare is not mentioned*; nor, when the two plays were published in 1600, did the printer ascribe them to our author in the title-page, (though his reputation was then at the highest,) as surely he would have done, had they been his compositions.

In a subsequent edition indeed of the same pieces, printed by one Pavier, without date, but in reality in 1619, after our great poet's death, the name of Shakspeare appears; but this was a bookseller's trick, founded upon our author's celebrity; on his having new modelled these plays; and on the proprietors of the Globe and Blackfriars' theatre not having published Shakspeare's *Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI.* The very same deception was practised with respect to *King John*. The old play (written perhaps by the same person who was the author of *The Contention of the two famous Houses, &c.*) was printed in 1591, like that piece, *anonymously*. In 1611, (Shakspeare's *King John*, founded on the same story, having been probably often acted and admired,) the old piece in two parts was reprinted; and, in order to deceive the purchaser, was said in the title-page to be written by *W. Sb.* A subsequent printer in 1622 grew more bold, and affixed Shakspeare's name to it at full length.

It is observable that Millington the bookseller, by whom *The first part of the Contention of the two famous Houses, &c.* was entered at Stationers' Hall, in 1593-4, and for whom that piece and *The Tragedie of the duke of Yorke, &c.* were printed in 1600, was not the proprietor of any one of Shakspeare's undisputed plays, except *King Henry V.* of which he published a *spurious* copy, that, I think, must have been imperfectly taken down in short-hand in the play-house.

<sup>4</sup> They were probably printed in 1600, because Shakspeare's alterations of them were then popular, as *King Leir and his three daughters* was printed in 1605, because our author's play was probably at that time first produced.

The next observable circumstance with respect to these two quarto plays, is, that they are said in their title-pages to have been "sundry times acted by the earle of Pembroke his servantes." *Titus Andronicus* and *The old Taming of a Shrew* were acted by the same company of Comedians; but not *one* of our author's plays is said in its title-page to have been acted by any but the Lord Chamberlain's, or the Queen's, or King's servants. This circumstance alone, in my opinion, might almost decide the question.

This much appears on the first superficial view of these pieces; but the passage quoted by Mr. Tyrwhitt from an old pamphlet, entitled *Greene's Groatsworth of Witte*, &c. affords a still more decisive support to the hypothesis that I am endeavouring to maintain; which indeed that pamphlet first suggested to me. As this passage is the chief hinge of my argument, though it has already been printed in a preceding page, it is necessary to lay it again before the reader.—"Yes," says the writer, Robert Greene, (addressing himself, as Mr. Tyrwhitt conjectures with great probability, to his poetical friend George Peele,) "trust them [the players] not; for there is an upstart crowe BEAUTIFIED WITH OUR FEATHERS, that with his *tygres heart wrapt in a players hide* supposes hee is as well able to bombaste out a blank verse as the best of you; and being an absolute *Johannes fac totum*, is, in his own conceit, the only *Shake-scene* in a country."—"O tyger's heart, wrapt in a woman's hide!" is a line of the old quarto play, entitled *The first part of the Contention of the two houses*, &c.

That Shakspeare was here alluded to, cannot, I think, be doubted. But what does the writer mean by calling him "*a crow beautified with our feathers*?" My solution is, that GREENE and PEELE were the joint-authors of the two quarto plays, entitled *The first part of the Contention of the two famous houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, &c. and *The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke*, &c. or that Greene was the author of one, and Peele of the other. Greene's pamphlet, from whence the foregoing passage



is extracted, was written recently before his death, which happened in September 1592. How long he and Peele had been dramatick writers, is not precisely ascertained. Peele took the degree of Master of Arts at Oxford, in 1579: Greene took the same degree in Cambridge in 1583. Each of them has left four or five plays, and they wrote several others which have not been published. The earliest of Peele's printed pieces, *The Arraignment of Paris*, appeared in 1584; and one of Greene's pamphlets was printed in 1583. Between that year and 1591 it is highly probable that the two plays in question were written. I suspect they were produced in 1588 or 1589. We have undoubted proofs that Shakspeare was not above working on the materials of other men. His *Taming of the Shrew*, his *King John*, and other plays, render any arguments on that point unnecessary. Having therefore probably not long before the year 1592, when Greene wrote this dying exhortation to his friend, new-modelled and amplified these two pieces, and produced on the stage what in the folio edition of his Works are called *The Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.* and having acquired considerable reputation by them, Greene could not conceal the mortification that he felt at his own fame and that of his associate, both of them old and admired play-wrights, being eclipsed by a new *upstart* writer, (for so he calls our great poet,) who had then first perhaps attracted the notice of the publick by exhibiting two plays, formed upon old dramas written by them, considerably enlarged and improved. He therefore in direct terms charges him with having acted like the crow in the fable, *beautified himself with their feathers*; in other words, with having acquired fame *furtivis coloribus*, by new-modelling a work originally produced by them: and wishing to depretiate our author, he very naturally quotes a line from one of the pieces, which Shakspeare had thus *re-written*; a proceeding which the authors of the original plays considered as an invasion both of their literary property and character. This line with many others Shakspeare adopted without any alteration.



tion. The very term that Greene uses,—“to *bombast* out a blank verse,” exactly corresponds with what has been now suggested. This new poet, says he, knows as well as any man how to *amplify* and swell out a blank verse. *Bombast* was a soft stuff of a loose texture, by which garments were rendered more swelling and protuberant.

Several years after the death of Boiardo, Francesco Berni undertook to new-verify Boiardo's poem, entitled ORLANDO INNAMORATO. Berni (as Baretti observes) “was not satisfied with merely making the versification of that poem better; he interspersed it with many stanzas of his own, and changed almost all the beginnings of the cantos, introducing each of them with some moral reflection arising from the canto foregoing.” What Berni did to Boiardo's poem after the death of its author, and more, I suppose Shakspeare to have done to *The first part of the Contention of the two houses of Yorke and Lancaster, &c.* and *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, &c.* in the life time of Greene and Peele, their literary parents; and this *Risacimento* (as the Italians call it) of these two plays I suppose to have been executed by Shakspeare, and exhibited at the Globe or Blackfriars theatre, in the year 1591.

I have said Shakspeare did what Berni did, and more. He did not content himself with writing new beginnings to the acts; he new-verified, he new-modelled, he transposed many of the parts, and greatly amplified and improved the whole. Several lines, however, and even whole speeches which he thought sufficiently polished, he accepted, and introduced into his own work, without any, or with very slight, alterations.

In the present edition, all those lines which he adopted without any alteration, are printed in the usual manner; those speeches which he altered or expanded, are distinguished by inverted commas; and to all the lines entirely composed by himself asterisks are prefixed. The total number of lines in our author's *Second and Third Part of K. Henry VI.* is SIX THOUSAND AND FORTY-THREE:

of these, as I conceive, 1771 lines were written by some author who preceded Shakspeare; 2373 were formed by him on the foundation laid by his predecessors; and 1899 lines were entirely his own composition.

That the reader may have the whole of the subject before him, I shall here transcribe the fourth scene of the fourth act of *The Third Part of K. Henry VI.* (which happens to be a short one,) together with the corresponding scene in the original play; and also a speech of Queen Margaret in the fifth act, with the original speech on which it is formed. The first specimen will serve to shew the method taken by Shakspeare, where he only new-polished the language of the old play, rejecting some part of the dialogue, and making some slight additions to the part which he retained; the second is a striking proof of his facility and vigour of composition, which has happily expanded a thought comprized originally in a very short speech, into thirty-seven lines, none of which appear feeble or superfluous.

THE TRUE TRAGEDIE OF RICHARDE DUKE OF  
YORKE, &c. Sign. F. 4. edit. 1600.

*Enter the Queene, and the Lord Rivers.*

*Riv.* Tell me, good madam,  
Why is your grace so passionate of late.

*Queene.* Why, brother Rivers, heare you not the news  
Of that success king Edward had of late?

*Riv.* What? losse of some pitcht battaile against War-  
wick?

Tush; fear not, faire queen, but cast these cares aside.  
King Edwards noble minde his honours doth display;  
And Warwicke may lose, though then he got the day.

*Queene.* If that were all, my griefes were at an end;  
But greater troubles will, I feare, befall.

*Riv.* What? is he taken prisoner by the foe,  
To the danger of his royal person then?

*Queene.* I, there's my griefe; king Edward is sur-  
prised,  
And led away as prisoner unto Yorke.

*Riv.*

*Riv.* The newes is passing strange, I must confesse;  
Yet comfort yourselfe, for Edward hath more friends  
Than Lancaster at this time must perceive,—  
That some will set him in his throne againe.

*Queene.* God grant they may! but gentle brother, come,  
And let me leane upon thine arm a while,  
Untill I come unto the sanctuarie;  
There to preserve the fruit within my womb,  
King Edwards seed, true heir to Englands crowne.

[*Exeunt.*]

## KING HENRY VI. PART III. ACT IV. SCENE IV.

*Enter the QUEEN, and RIVERS.*

*Riv.* Madam, what makes you in this sudden change?

*Queen.* Why, brother Rivers, are you yet to learn,  
What late misfortune is befall'n king Edward?

*Riv.* What, loss of some pitch'd battle against Warwick?

*Queen.* No, but the loss of his own royal person:

*Riv.* Then is my sovereign slain?

*Queen.* Ay, almost slain, for he is taken prisoner;  
Either betray'd by falshood of his guard,  
Or by his foe surpriz'd at unawares;  
And, as I further have to understand,  
Is new committed to the bishop of York,  
Fell Warwick's brother, and by that our foe.

*Riv.* These news, I must confess, are full of grief:  
Yet gracious madam, bear it as you may;  
Warwick may lose, that now hath won the day.

*Queen.* Till then, fair hope must hinder life's decay.  
And I the rather wean me from despair,  
For love of Edward's offspring in my womb:  
This is it that makes me bridle passion,  
And bear with mildness my misfortune's cross;  
Ay, ay, for this I draw in many a tear,  
And stop the rising of blood-sucking sighs,  
Lest with my sighs or tears I blast or drown  
King Edward's fruit, true heir to the English crown.

*Riv.* But, madam, where is Warwick then become?

B 3

*Queen.*

*Queen.* I am informed, that he comes towards London  
 To set the crown once more on Henry's head :  
 Guess thou the rest ; king Edward's friends must down.  
 But, to prevent the tyrant's violence,  
 (For trust not him that once hath broken faith,)  
 I'll hence forthwith unto the sanctuary,  
 To save at least the heir of Edward's right ;  
 There shall I rest secure from force, and fraud.  
 Come therefore, let us fly, while we may fly ;  
 If Warwick take us, we are sure to die. [Exeunt.]

THE TRUE TRAGÉDIE OF RICHARDE DUKE OF  
 YORKE, &c. Sign. G 4. edit. 1600.

*Enter the Queene, Prince Edward, Oxford, Somerset,  
 with drumme and souldiers.*

*Queene.* Welcome to England, my loving friends of France ;  
 And welcome Somerset and Oxford too.  
 Once more have we spread our sailes abroad ;  
 And though our tackling be almost consumde,  
 And Warwicke as our main-mast overthrowne,  
 Yet, warlike lordes, raise you that sturdie post,  
 That bears the sailes to bring us unto rest ;  
 And Ned and I, as willing pilots should,  
 For once with careful mindes guide on the sterne,  
 To bear us thorough that dangerous gulfe,  
 That heretofore hath swallowed up our friendes.

KING HENRY VI. PART III. ACT V. SCENE IV.

*March. Enter Queen MARGARET, Prince EDWARD,  
 SOMERSET, OXFORD, and Soldiers.*

*Q. Mar.* Great lords, wise men ne'er sit and wail their loss,  
 But cheerly seek how to redress their harms.  
 What though the mast be now blown over-board,  
 The cable broke, the holding anchor lost,  
 And half our sailors swallow'd in the flood ?  
 Yet lives our pilot still : Is't meet, that he  
 Should leave the helm, and, like a fearful lad,  
 With tearful eyes add water to the sea,  
 And give more strength to that which hath too much ;  
 Whiles,



# KING HENRY VI.

25

Whiles, in his moan, the ship splits on the rock,  
Which industry and courage might have sav'd?  
Ah, what a shame! ah, what a fault were this!  
Say, Warwick was our anchor; What of that?  
And Montague our top-mast; What of him?  
Our slaughter'd friends the tackles; What of these?  
Why, is not Oxford here another anchor?  
And Somerset another goodly mast?  
The friends of France our shrouds and tacklings?  
And, though unskilful, why not Ned and I  
For once allow'd the skilful pilot's charge?  
We will not from the helm, to sit and weep;  
But keep our course, though the rough wind say—no,  
From shelves and rocks that threaten us with wreck.  
As good to chide the waves, as speak them fair.  
And what is Edward, but a ruthless sea?  
What Clarence, but a quick-sand of deceit?  
And Richard, but a ragged fatal rock?  
All these the enemies to our poor bark.  
Say, you can swim; alas, 'tis but a while:  
Tread on the sand; why, there you quickly sink:  
Besride the rock; the tide will wash you off,  
Or else you famish, that's a threefold death.  
This speak I, lords, to let you understand,  
In case some one of you would fly from us,  
That there's no hop'd for mercy with the brothers,  
More than with ruthless waves, with sands, and rocks.  
Why, courage, then! what cannot be avoided,  
'Twere childish weakness to lament, or fear<sup>s</sup>.

If the reader wishes to compare *The first part of the Con-  
tention of the two houses*, &c. with *The Second Part of King  
Henry VI.* which was formed upon it, he will find  
various passages quoted from the elder drama in the  
notes on that play. The two celebrated scenes, in which  
the dead body of the duke of Gloster is described, and the  
death of Cardinal Beaufort is represented, may be worth

<sup>s</sup> Compare also the account of the death of the duke of York  
(p. 269) and King Henry's Soliloquy (p. 287) with the old play as  
quoted in the notes.—Sometimes our author new-verified the old,  
without the addition of any new matter. See p. 335, n. 1.



examining with this view; and will sufficiently ascertain how our author proceeded in new-modelling that play; with what expression, animation. and splendour of colouring he filled up the outline that had been sketched by a preceding writer<sup>6</sup>.

Shakspeare having thus given celebrity to these two old dramas, by altering and writing several parts of them over again, the bookseller, Millington, in 1593-4, to avail himself of the popularity of the new and admired poet, got, perhaps from Peele, who was then living, or from the author, whoever he was, or from some of the comedians belonging to the earl of Pembroke, the *original* play on which *the Second Part of K. Henry VI.* was founded; and entered it on the Stationers' books, certainly with an intention to publish it. Why it did not then appear, cannot be now ascertained. But both that, and the other piece on which *The Third Part of King Henry VI.* was formed, was printed by the same bookseller in 1600, either with a view to lead the common reader to suppose that he should purchase two plays *as altered* and new-modelled by Shakspeare, or, without any such fraudulent intention, to derive a profit from the exhibition of a work that so great a writer had thought proper to retouch, and form into those dramas which for several years before 1600 had without doubt been performed with considerable applause. In the same manner *The old Taming of a Shrew*, on which our author formed a play, had been entered at Stationers' Hall in 1594, and was printed in 1607, without doubt with a view to pass it on the publick as the production of Shakspeare.

When William Pavier republished *The Contention of the two Houses*, &c. in 1619<sup>7</sup>, he omitted the words in the

<sup>6</sup> See p. 135, n. 8; and p. 196, n. 9. Compare also Clifford's speech to the rebels in p. 229, Buckingham's address to King Henry in p. 249, and Iden's speech in p. 255, with the old play, as quoted in the notes.

<sup>7</sup> Pavier's edition has no date, but it is ascertained <sup>to</sup> have been printed in 1619, by the Signatures; the *last* of which is Q. The play of *Pericles* was printed in 1619, for the same bookseller, and its *first* signature is R. The undoubted copy, therefore, of *The Whole Contention*, &c. and *Pericles*, must have been printed at the same time.

original

original title page,—“as it was acted by the earl of Pembroke his servantes;”—just as, on the republication of *King John* in two parts, in 1611, the words,—“as it was acted in the honourable city of London,”—were omitted; because the omitted words in both cases marked the respective pieces not to be the production of Shakspeare<sup>8</sup>. And as in *King John* the letters *W. Sh.* were added in 1611 to deceive the purchaser, so in the republication of *The Whole Contention*, &c. Pavier, having dismissed the words above mentioned, inserted these: “*Newly CORRECTED and ENLARGED by William Shakspeare;*” knowing that these pieces had been made the ground work of two other plays; that they had in fact been *corrected* and *enlarged*, (though not in that copy which Pavier printed, which is a mere republication from the edition of 1600,) and exhibited under the titles of *The Second and Third Part of K. Henry VI.*; and hoping that this new edition of the *original* plays would pass for those *altered and augmented* by Shakspeare, which were then unpublished.

If Shakspeare had originally written these three plays of *King Henry VI.* would they not probably have been found by the bookseller in the same Ms.? Would not the three parts have been procured, whether surreptitiously or otherwise, *all together*? Would they not in that Ms. have borne the titles of the *First and Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.*? And would not the bookseller have entered them on the Stationers’ books, and published such of them as he did publish, under those titles, and *with the name of Shakspeare*? On the other hand, if that which is now distinguished by the name of *The First Part of King Henry VI.* but which I suppose in those times was only called “*The historical play of King Henry VI.*” if this was the production of some old dramatist, if it had appeared on the stage some years before 1591, (as from Nashe’s mention of it seems to be implied,) perhaps in 1587 or 1588, if its popularity was in 1594 in its wane, and the attention of the publick was entirely taken up by Shakspeare’s alteration of two other plays which had likewise appeared before 1591, would

<sup>8</sup> See *An Attempt to ascertain the order of Shakspeare’s plays*, Vol. I. Article, *King John*.

not the superior popularity of these two pieces, altered by such a poet, attract the notice of the booksellers? and finding themselves unable to procure them from the theatre, would they not gladly seize on the *originals* on which this new and admired writer had worked, and publish them as soon as they could, neglecting entirely the preceding old play, or *First Part of King Henry VI.* (as it is now called) which Shakspeare had not embellished with his pen?—Such, we have seen, was actually the process; for Thomas Millington, neglecting entirely *The First Part of K. Henry VI.* entered the ORIGINAL of *The Second Part of K. Henry VI.* at Stationers' Hall in 1593-4, and published the ORIGINALS of both that and *The Third Part* in 1600. When Heminge and Condell printed these three pieces in folio, they were necessarily obliged to name the old play of *King Henry VI.* the *first* part, to distinguish it from the two following historical dramas, founded on a later period of the same king's reign.

Having examined such external evidence as time has left us concerning these two plays, now denominated *The Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI.* let us see whether we cannot by internal marks ascertain how far Shakspeare was concerned in their composition.

It has long been a received opinion that the two quarto plays, one of which was published under the title of *The First Part of the Contention of the two Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, &c.* and the other under the title of *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, &c.* were spurious and imperfect copies of Shakspeare's *Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.*; and many passages have been quoted in the notes to the late editions of Shakspeare, as containing merely the various readings of the quartos and the folio; the passages being supposed to be in substance the same, only variously exhibited in different copies. The variations have been accounted for, by supposing that the imperfect and spurious quarto copies (as they were called) were taken down either by an unskilful short-hand writer, or by some auditor who picked up “during the representation what the time would permit, then filled up some of his omissions at a second or third hearing, and when he  
had

had by this method formed something like a play, sent it to the printer. To this opinion, I with others for a long time subscribed: two of Heywood's pieces furnishing indubitable proofs that plays in the time of our author were sometimes imperfectly copied during the representation, by the ear, or by short-hand writers<sup>9</sup>. But a minute examination of the two pieces in question, and a careful comparison of them with Shakspeare's *Second* and *Third Part of King Henry VI.* have convinced me that this could not have been the case with respect to them. No fraudulent copyist or short-hand writer would invent circumstances *totally different* from those which appear in Shakspeare's new-modelled draughts as exhibited in the first folio; or insert *whole speeches*, of which scarcely a trace is found in that edition. In the course of the foregoing notes many of these have been particularly pointed out. I shall now bring into one point of view all those internal circumstances which prove in my apprehension decisively, that the quarto plays were not spurious and imperfect copies of Shakspeare's pieces, but elder dramas on which he formed his *Second* and *Third Part of King Henry VI.*

1. In some places a speech in one of these quartos consists of ten or twelve lines. In Shakspeare's folio the same speech consists of perhaps only half the number<sup>1</sup>. A copyist by the ear, or an unskilful short-hand writer, might mutilate and exhibit a poet's thoughts or expressions imperfectly; but would he dilate and amplify them, or introduce totally new matter? Assuredly he would not.

2. Some circumstances are mentioned in the old quarto plays, of which there is not the least trace in the folio; and many minute variations are found between them and the folio, that prove the pieces in quarto to have been original and distinct compositions.

In the last act of the *First Part of the Contention*, &c. the duke of Buckingham after the battle of Saint Albans, is brought in wounded, and carried to his tent; but in Shak-

<sup>9</sup> See p. 377.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 127, n. 2; p. 150, n. 8; p. 154, n. \*; p. 243, n. \*; p. 333, n. 7; and p. 356, n. 2.



spere's play he is not introduced on the stage after that battle.

In one of the *original* scenes between Jack Cade and his followers, which Shakspeare has made the seventh scene of the fourth act of his *Second Part of King Henry VI.* Dick Butcher drags a serjeant, that is, a catch-pole, on the stage, and a dialogue consisting of seventeen lines passes between Cade, &c. at the conclusion of which it is determined that the serjeant shall be "brain'd with his own mace." Of this not one word appears in our author's play<sup>2</sup>. In the same piece Jack Cade, hearing that a knight, called Sir Humphrey Stafford, was coming at the head of an army against him, to put himself on a par with him makes himself a knight; and finding that Stafford's brother was also a knight, he dubs Dick Butcher also. But in Shakspeare's play the latter circumstance is omitted.

In the old play Somerset goes out immediately after he is appointed regent of France. In Shakspeare's *Second Part of King Henry VI.* he continues on the stage with Henry to the end of the scene (Act I. sc. iii.) and the king addresses him as they go out.

In the old play, the dutchess of Gloster enters with Hume, Bolinbroke, and Margery Jourdain, and after some conversation with them, tells them that while they perform their rites, she will go to the top of an adjoining tower, and there write down such answers as the spirits, that they are to raise, shall give to her questions. But in Shakspeare's play, Hume, *Southwell*, (who is not introduced in the elder drama) and Bolingbroke, &c. enter without the dutchess; and after some conversation the dutchess appears above, (that is, on the tower,) and encourages them to proceed<sup>3</sup>.

In Shakspeare's play, when the duke of York enters, and finds the dutchess of Gloster, &c. and her co-adjutors performing their magick rites, (p. 141,) the duke seizes the paper in which the answers of the spirit to certain questions

<sup>2</sup> See p. 227, n. \*; and *The First Part of the Contention*, &c. 1600, Sign. G. 3.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 137, n. 2.

are written down, and reads them aloud. In the old play the answers are not here recited by York; but in a subsequent scene Buckingham reads them to the king; (see p. 141, n. 9, and p. 149, n. 3.) and this is one of the many transpositions that Shakspeare made in new-modelling these pieces, of which I shall speak more fully hereafter.

In the old play, when the king pronounces sentence on the dutchess of Gloster, he particularly mentions the mode of her penance; and the sentence is pronounced in prose. "Stand forth dame Eleanor Cobham, dutchess of Gloster, and hear the sentence pronounced against thee for these treasons that thou hast committed against us, our state and peers. First, for thy haynous crimes thou shalt *two daies* in London do penance *barefoot in the streets, with a white sheete about thy bodie, and a wax taper burning in thy hand*: that done, thou shalt be banished for ever into the Isle of Man, there to end thy wretched daies; and this is our sentence irrevocable.—Away with her." But in Shakspeare's play, (p. 155) the king pronounces sentence in *verse* against the dutchess *and her confederates* at the same time; and only says in general, that "after *three* days open penance, she shall be banished to the Isle of Man."

In Shakspeare's play, (p. 175) when the duke of York undertakes to subdue the Irish rebels, if he be furnished with a sufficient army, *Suffolk* says, that he "will see that charge performed." But in the old play the queen enjoins *the duke of Buckingham* to attend to this business, and he accepts the office.

In our author's play Jack Cade is described as a *clothier*, in the old play he is "the *dyer* of Ashford." In the same piece, when the king and Somerset appear at Kenelworth, a dialogue passes between them and the queen, of which not one word is preserved in the corresponding scene in *The Second Part of King Henry VI.* (p. 231.) In the old play, Buckingham states to the king the grounds on which York had taken up arms; but in Shakspeare's piece, (p. 242,) York himself assigns his reasons for his conduct.

In the old play near the conclusion, young Clifford,  
when

when he is preparing to carry off the dead body of his father, is assaulted by Richard, and after putting him to flight, he makes a speech consisting of four lines. But in Shakspeare's play (p. 252) there is no combat between them, nor is Richard introduced in that scene. The four lines therefore above mentioned are necessarily omitted.

In the old play the queen drops her glove, and finding that the dutcheſs of Gloſter makes no attempt to take it up, ſhe gives her a box on the ear :

“ Give me my *glove*; why, minion, can you not ſee ?”

But in Shakspeare's play, (p. 133,) the queen drops not a glove, but a *fan* :

“ Give me my *fan*: What, minion, can you not?”

In Shakspeare's *Second Part of King Henry VI.* (p. 201,) Suffolk diſcovers himſelf to the captain who had ſeized him, by ſhewing his *George*. In the old play he announces his quality by a *ring*, a ſeal-ring we may ſuppoſe, exhibiting his arms. In the ſame ſcene of Shakspeare's play, he obſerves that the captain threatens more

“ Than *Bargulus*, the ſtrong *Illyrian* pirate.”

But in the elder drama Suffolk ſays, he

“ Threatens more plagues than mighty *Abradas*,

“ The great *Macedonian* pirate.”

In the ſame ſcene of the original play the captain threatens to *ſink* Suffolk's ſhip; but no ſuch menace is found in Shakspeare's play.

In *The True Tragedie of Richard duke of York, &c.* Richard (afterwards duke of Gloſter) informs Warwick that his *father* the earl of Salisbury was killed in an action which he deſcribes, and which in fact took place at Ferrybridge in Yorkſhire. But Shakspeare in his *Third Part of King Henry VI.* (p. 283) formed upon the piece above-mentioned, has rightly deviated from it, and for *father* ſubſtituted *brother*, it being the natural brother of Warwick, (the

baſtard

bastard son of Salisbury) that fell at Ferrybridge. The earl of Salisbury, Warwick's father, was beheaded at Pomfret.

In the same old play a son is introduced who has killed his father, and afterwards a father who has killed his son. King Henry, who is on the stage, says not a word till they have both appeared, and spoken; he then pronounces a speech of seven lines. But in Shakspeare's play (p. 290.) this speech is enlarged, and two speeches formed on it; the first of which the king speaks after the son has appeared, and the other after the entry of the father.

In our author's play, (p. 322,) after Edward's marriage with Lady Grey, his brothers enter, and converse on that event. The king, queen, &c. then join them, and Edward asks Clarence how he approves his choice. In the elder play there is no previous dialogue between Gloster and Clarence; but the scene opens with the entry of the king, &c. who desires the opinion of his brothers on his recent marriage.

In our author's play (p. 311,) the following line is found:

“ And set the *murderous Machiavel* to school.”

This line in *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke*, &c. stood thus:

“ And set the *aspiring Cataline* to school.”

Cataline was the person that would naturally occur to Peele or Greene, as the most splendid *classical* example of inordinate ambition; but Shakspeare, who was more conversant with English books, substituted Machiavel, whose name was in such frequent use in his time that it became a specifick term for a consummate politician<sup>4</sup>; and accordingly he makes his host in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, when he means to boast of his own shrewdness, exclaim, “ Am I subtle? am I a *Machiavel*?”

Many other variations beside those already mentioned might be pointed out; but that I may not weary the reader, I will only refer in a note to the most striking diversities that

<sup>4</sup> See p. 104, n. 5. of this volume.



are found between Shakspeare's *Second* and *Third Part of King Henry VI.* and the elder dramas printed in quarto<sup>5</sup>.

The supposition of imperfect or spurious copies cannot account for such numerous variations in the *circumstances* of these pieces; (not to insist at present on the *language* in which they are clothed;) so that we are compelled (as I have already observed) to maintain, either that Shakspeare wrote *two* plays on the story which forms his *Second Part of King Henry VI.* a hasty sketch, and an entirely distinct and more finished performance; or else we must acknowledge that he formed that piece on a foundation laid by another writer, that is, upon the quarto copy of *The First Part of the Con-  
tention of the Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, &c.*—And the same argument precisely applies to *The Third Part of King Henry VI.* which is founded on *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, &c.* printed in quarto, 1600.

Let us now advert to the *Resemblances* that are found in these pieces as exhibited in the folio, to passages in our author's undisputed plays; and also to the *Inconsistencies* that may be traced between them; and, if I do not deceive myself, both the one and the other will add considerable support to the foregoing observations.

In our author's genuine plays, he frequently borrows from himself, the same thoughts being found in nearly the same expressions in different pieces. In *The Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.* as in his other dramas, these coincidences with his other works may be found<sup>6</sup>; and this was one of the circumstances that once weighed much in my mind, and convinced me of their authenticity. But a collation of these plays with the old pieces on which they are founded, has shewn me the fallacy by which I was de-

<sup>5</sup> See p. 127, n. 2; p. 137, n. 1; p. 139, n. 3; p. 140, n. 8; p. 154, n. \*; p. 170, n. 2; p. 174, n. 5; p. 178, n. 2; p. 199, n. 8; p. 201, n. 2; p. 205, n. 6; p. 227, n. 7; p. 231, n. 4; p. 242, n. 9, and n. \*; p. 255, n. 6; p. 265, n. 7; p. 267, n. 2; p. 268, n. 7; p. 272, n. 9; p. 274, n. 2; p. 275, n. 4; p. 278, n. 4; p. 283, n. 8; p. 286, n. 4; p. 290, n. 5; p. 311, n. 9; p. 321, n. 4; p. 328, n. 8, and n. 9; p. 350, n. 8.

<sup>6</sup> See p. 127, n. 7; p. 131, n. 7; p. 193, n. 1; p. 197, n. \*; p. 206, n. 8; p. 227, n. 7; p. 256, n. 9; p. 287, n. 8; p. 300, n. 6; p. 358, n. 8; and p. 363, n. 9.

ceived; for the passages of these two parts of *K. Henry VI.* which correspond with others in our author's undisputed plays, exist *only* in the *folio* copy, and not in the *quarto*; in other words, in those parts of these new-modelled pieces, which were of Shakspeare's writing, and not in the originals by another hand, on which he worked. This, I believe, will be found invariably the case, except in three instances.

The first is, "You have no children, butchers;" which is, it must be acknowledged, in *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, &c.* 1600; (as well as in *The Third Part of King Henry VI.*) and is also introduced with a slight variation in *Macbeth*¹.

Another instance is found in *K. John*. That king, when charged with the death of his nephew, asks,

"Think you, I bear the shears of destiny?"

"Have I commandment on the pulse of life?"

which bears a striking resemblance to the words of Cardinal Beaufort in *The first part of the Contention of the two houses, &c.* which Shakspeare has introduced in his *Second Part of King Henry VI.*

"—— Died he not in his bed?"

"Can I make men live whe'r they will or no?"

The third instance is found in *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke, &c.* In that piece are the following lines, which Shakspeare adopted with a very slight variation, and inserted in his *Third Part of King Henry VI.*:

"—— doves will peck in rescue of their brood.—

"Unreasonable creatures feed their young;

"And though man's face be fearful to their eyes,

"Yet, in protection of their tender ones,

"Who hath not seen them even with those same wings

"Which they have sometime used in fearful flight,

"Make war with him that climb'd unto their nest,

"Offering their own lives in their young's defence?"

So, in our author's *Macbeth*:

"—— the poor wren—

"The most diminutive of birds, will fight,

"Her young ones in the nest, against the owl."

¹ See p. 364, of this volume, and Vol. IV. p. 411.

But whoever recollects the various thoughts that Shakspeare has borrowed from preceding writers, will not be surpris'd that in a *similar* situation, in *Macbeth*, and *King John*, he should have us'd the expressions of an old dramatist, with whose writings he had been particularly conversant; expressions too, which he had before embodied in former plays: nor can, I think, these three instances much diminish the force of the foregoing observation. That it may have its full weight, I have in the present edition distinguished by asterisks all the lines in *The Second* and *Third Part of King Henry VI.* of which there is no trace in the old quarto plays, and which therefore I suppose to have been written by Shakspeare. Though this has not been effected without much trouble, yet, if it shall tend to settle this long-agitated question, I shall not consider my labour as wholly thrown away.

Perhaps a similar coincidence in *The First Part of King Henry VI.* may be urged in opposition to my hypothesis relative to that play. "Lean famine, quartering steel, and climbing fire," are in that piece called the attendants on the brave lord Talbot; as in Shakspeare's *King Henry V.* "famine, sword, and fire, are leash'd in like hounds, crouching under the martial Henry for employment." If this image had proceeded from our author's imagination, this coincidence might perhaps countenance the supposition that he had some hand at least in that scene of *The First Part of King Henry VI.* where these attendants on war are personified. But that is not the case; for the fact is, that Shakspeare was furnished with this imagery by a passage in *Holinshed*, as the author of the old play of *King Henry VI.* was by *Hall's Chronicle*: "The Goddesse of warre, called Bellonas—hath these three hand-maides ever of necessitie attendynge on her; *bloud, fyre, and famine* <sup>3</sup>."

In our present inquiry, it is, undoubtedly a very striking circumstance that *almost* all the passages in *The Second* and *Third Part of King Henry VI.* which resemble others in Shakspeare's undisputed plays, are not found in the original pieces in quarto, but in his *Risacimento* published in

<sup>3</sup> Hall's *Chron.* Henry VI. fol. xxix.

folio. As these *Resemblances* to his other plays, and a peculiar Shakspearian phraseology, ascertain a *considerable portion* of these disputed dramas to be the production of Shakspeare, so on the other hand certain passages which are *discordant* (in matters of fact) from his other plays, are proved by this *Discordancy*, not to have been composed by him; and these discordant passages, being found in the original quarto plays, prove that those pieces were composed by another writer.

Thus, in *The Third Part of King Henry VI.* (p. 303,) Sir John Grey is said to have lost "his life in quarrel of the house of York;" and king Edward stating the claim of his widow, whom he afterwards married, mentions, that his lands after the battle of Saint Albans (February 17, 1460-1) "were seized on by the conqueror." Whereas in fact they were seized on by Edward himself after the battle of Towton, (in which he was conqueror,) March 29, 1461. The conqueror at the second battle of Saint Albans, the battle here meant, was Queen Margaret. This statement was taken from the old quarto play; and, from carelessness was adopted by Shakspeare without any material alteration. But at a subsequent period when he wrote his *King Richard III.* he was under a necessity of carefully examining the English chronicles; and in that play, Act I. sc. iii. he has represented this matter truly as it was:

"In all which time, you, and your husband Grey,  
 "Were *factious* for the house of Lancaster;—  
 "(And, Rivers, so were you;)—Was not your husband  
 "In Margaret's battle at Saint Albans slain?"

It is called "Margaret's battle," because she was there victorious.

An equally decisive circumstance is furnished by the same play. In *The Third Part of King Henry VI.* (p. 320.) Warwick proposes to marry his *eldest* daughter (*Isabella*) to Edward prince of Wales, and the proposal is accepted by Edward; and in a subsequent scene Clarence says, he will marry the *younger* daughter (*Anne*). In these particulars Shakspeare has implicitly followed the elder drama. But the fact is, that the prince of Wales married Anne the *younger* daughter of the earl of Warwick, and the duke of



Clarence married the *elder*, Isabella. Though the author of *The true Tragedie of the duke of Yorke, &c.* was here inaccurate, and though Shakspeare too negligently followed his steps,—when he wrote his *King Richard III.* he had gained better information; for there Lady ANNE is rightly represented as the widow of the prince of Wales, and the *youngest* daughter of the earl of Warwick:

“ Which done, God take king Edward to his mercy,  
 “ And leave the world to me to baffle in.  
 “ For then I’ll marry Warwick’s *youngest* daughter;  
 “ What though I kill’d her husband, and her father,” &c.

i. e. Edward prince of Wales, and king Henry VI.

*King Richard III.* Act I. sc. i.

I have said that certain passages in *The Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.* are ascertained to be Shakspeare’s by a peculiar phraseology. This peculiar phraseology, without a single exception, distinguishes such parts of these plays as are found in the folio, and not in the *elder* quarto dramas, of which the phraseology, as well as the versification, is of a different colour. This observation applies not only to the new original matter produced by Shakspeare, but to his alteration of the old. Our author in his undoubted compositions has fallen into an inaccuracy, of which I do not recollect a similar instance in the works of any other dramatist. When he has occasion to quote the same paper twice, (not from memory, but *verbatim*,) from negligence he does not always attend to the words of the paper which he has occasion to quote, but makes one of the persons of the drama recite them with variations, though he holds the very paper quoted before his eyes. Thus, in *All’s well that ends well*, Act V. sc. iii. Helena says,

“ —here’s your letter; This it says:  
 “ *When from my finger you can get this ring,*  
 “ *And are by me with child,*”—

Yet, as I have observed in Vol. IV. p. 55, n. 6. Helena in Act III. sc. ii. *reads* this very letter aloud, and there  
 the

the words are different, and in plain prose: "When thou canst get the ring from my finger, which never shall come off, and shew me a child begotten of thy body," &c. In like manner, in the first scene of *The Second Part of King Henry VI.* Suffolk presents to the duke of Gloster, protector of the realm, the articles of peace concluded between France and England. The protector begins to read the articles, but when he has proceeded no further than these words,—“Item, that the *dutchy* of Anjou and the *county* of Maine shall be released and delivered to the king her father,”—he is suddenly taken ill, and rendered incapable of proceeding: on which the bishop of Winchester is called upon to read the remainder of the paper. He accordingly reads the whole of the article, of which the duke of Gloster had only read a part: “Item, *It is further agreed between them, that the dutchies of Anjou and Maine shall be released and delivered over to the king her father, and she sent,*” &c. Now though Maine in our old chronicles is sometimes called a county, and sometimes a dutchy, yet words cannot thus change their form under the eyes of two readers: nor do they in the original play, entitled *The first part of the Contention of the two houses*, &c for there the article as recited by the protector corresponds with that recited by the bishop, without the most minute variation. “Item, It is further agreed between them, that the *dutchies of Anjou and of Maine shall be released and delivered over to the king her father, and she sent,*” &c. Thus in the old play says the duke, and so says the cardinal after him. This one circumstance, in my apprehension, is of such weight, that though it stood alone, it might decide the present question. Our author has fallen into a similar inaccuracy in the fourth scene of the same act, where the duke of York recites from a paper the questions that had been put to the Spirit, relative to the duke of Suffolk, Somerset<sup>o</sup>, &c.

Many minute marks of Shakspeare's hand may be traced in such parts of the old plays as he has new-modelled. I at present recollect one that must strike every

<sup>o</sup> See p. 141, n. <sup>o</sup>.

reader who is conversant with his writings. He very frequently uses adjectives adverbially; and this kind of phraseology, if not peculiar to him, is found more frequently in his writings than those of any of his contemporaries. Thus,—“I am myself *indifferent* honest;”—“as *dishonourable* ragged as an old faced ancient;”—“*equal* ravenous;”—“leaves them *invisible*”; &c. In *The true Tragedie of the Duke of Yorke*, &c. the king, having determined to marry Lady Grey, enjoins his brothers to use her *honourably*. But in Shakspeare's play the words are,—“use her *honourable*.” So, in *Julius Cæsar*:

“Young man, thou could'st not die more *honourable*.”

In like manner, in *The Third Part of King Henry VI.* we find this line:

“Is either slain, or wounded *dangerous*.”

but in the old play the words are—“wounded *dangerously*.”

In the same play the word *handkerchief* is used; but in the corresponding scene in *The Third Part of King Henry VI.* (p. 270.) Shakspeare has substituted the northern term *napkin*, which occurs so often in his works, in its room.

The next circumstance to which I wish to call the attention of those who do not think the present investigation wholly incurious, is, the *Transpositions* that are found in these plays. In the preceding notes I have frequently observed that not only several lines, but sometimes whole scenes<sup>2</sup>, were transposed by Shakspeare.

In p. 270, a Messenger, giving an account of the death of the duke of York, says,

“Environed he was with many foes;

“And stood against them, as the hope of Troy

“Against the Greeks, that would have enter'd Troy.

“But Hercules himself must yield to odds;”—

When this passage was printed, not finding any trace

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. V. p. 233, n. 3; Vol. IV. p. 564, n. 6; Vol. III. p. 441, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 335, n. 9; p. 340, n. 6; p. 344, n. 5.

of the last three lines in the corresponding part of the old play, I marked them inadvertently as Shakspeare's original composition; but I afterwards found that he had borrowed them from a subsequent scene on a quite different subject, in which Henry, taking leave of Warwick, says to him,

"Farewell my Hector, and my Troy's true hope!"

and the last line, "But Hercules," &c. is spoken by Warwick near the conclusion of the piece, after he is mortally wounded in the battle of Barnet.

So, in *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke*, &c. after the duke has slain Clifford, he says,

"Now, Lancaster, sit sure:—thy sinews shrink."

Shakspeare has not made use of that line in that place, but availed himself of it afterwards, where Edward brings forth Warwick wounded; *King Henry VI.* P. III. Act V. sc. ii.

"Now, Mountague, sit fast: I seek for thee," &c.

Many other transpositions may be traced in these plays, to which I shall only refer in a note<sup>3</sup>.

Such transpositions as I have noticed, could never have arisen from any carelessness or inaccuracy of transcribers or copyists; and therefore are to be added to the many other circumstances which prove that *The Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI.*, as exhibited in the folio, were formed from the materials of a preceding writer.

It is also observable, that many lines are repeated in Shakspeare's *Second and Third Part of King Henry VI.*<sup>4</sup>, but no such repetitions are found in the old quarto plays. The repetition undoubtedly arose from Shakspeare's not always following his original strictly, but introducing expressions which had struck him in other parts of the old plays; and afterwards, forgetting that he had before used such expressions, he suffered them to remain in their original places also.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 193, n. 9; p. 211, n. 5; p. 245, n. 8; p. 330, n. 4; p. 354, n. 8, and n. 9; p. 359, n. 9.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 287, n. 6; p. 301, n. 9; p. 313, n. 2; p. 317, n. \*.



Another proof that Shakspeare was not the author of *The Contention of the two houses*, &c. is furnished by the inconsistencies into which he has fallen, by sometimes adhering to, and sometimes deviating from, his original : an inaccuracy which may be sometimes observed in his undisputed plays.

One of the most remarkable instances of this kind of inconsistency is found in *The Second Part of K. Henry VI.* p. 217, where he makes Henry say,

“ I'll send some holy bishop to entreat,” &c.

a circumstance which he took from Holinshed's Chronicle ; whereas in the old play no mention is made of a bishop on this occasion. The king there says, he will himself come and parley with the rebels, and in the mean time he orders Clifford and Buckingham to gather an army. In a subsequent scene, however, Shakspeare forgot the new matter which he had introduced in the former ; and Clifford and Buckingham only parley with Cade, &c. conformably to the old play<sup>s</sup>.

In *Romeo and Juliet* he has fallen into a similar inaccuracy. In the poem on which that tragedy is founded, Romeo, in his interview with the Friar, after sentence of banishment has been pronounced against him, is described as passionately lamenting his fate in the following terms :

“ First nature did he blame, the author of his life,  
 “ In which his joys had been so scant, and sorrows  
     aye so rife ;  
 “ The time and place of birth he fiercely did reprove ;  
 “ He cryed out with open mouth against the stars  
     above.—  
 “ On fortune eke he rail'd,” &c.

The friar afterwards reproves him for want of patience. In forming the corresponding scene Shakspeare has omitted Romeo's invective against his fate, but inadvertently copied the friar's remonstrance as it lay before him :

“ Why rail'st thou on thy birth, the heaven, and earth ?”

<sup>s</sup> See also p. 139, n. 6 ; p. 316, n. 6 ; and p. 317, n. 6.

If the following should be considered as a trifling circumstance, let it be remembered, that circumstances which, separately considered, may appear unimportant, sometimes acquire strength, when united to other proofs of more efficacy: in my opinion, however, what I shall now mention is a circumstance of considerable weight. It is observable that the priest concerned with Eleanor Cobham Dutcheſs of Gloceſter, in certain pretended operations of magick, for which ſhe was tried, is called by Hall, John *Hume*: So is he named in *The first part of the Contention of the two Houſes of Yorke, &c.* the original, as I ſuppoſe, of *The Second Part of K. Henry VI.* Our author probably thinking the name harſh or ridiculous, ſoftened it to *Hume*; and by that name this prieſt is called in *his* play printed in folio. But in Holinſhed he is named *Hun*; and ſo undoubtedly, or perhaps for ſoftneſs, *Hune*, he would have been called in the original quarto play juſt mentioned, if Shakspeare had been the author of it; for Holinſhed and not Hall was his guide, as I have ſhewn incontestably in a note on *King Henry V.* Vol. V. p. 40. But Hall was undoubtedly the hiſtorian who had been conſulted by the original writer of *The Contention of the two Houſes of Yorke and Lancaſter*; as appears from his having taken a line from thence, “That *Alexander Iden*, an eſquire of Kent<sup>6</sup>,” and from the ſcene in which Cardinal Beaufort is exhibited on his death-bed. One part of the particular deſcription of the Cardinal’s death and dying words, in the old quarto play, is founded on a paſſage in Hall, which Holinſhed, though in general a ſervile copyiſt of the former chronicler, has omitted. The paſſage is this. “Dr. John Baker, his pryvie counſailer and hys chappellayn, wrote, that lying on his death-bed he [Cardinal Beaufort] ſaid theſe words: ‘Why ſhould I dye, having ſo much riches? If the whole realme would ſave my lyfe, I am able either by pollicie to get it, or, by ryches to bye it. Fye! will not death be hyered, nor will money

<sup>6</sup> See Hall, Henry V. fol. lxxix. Holinſhed ſays, “a gentleman of Kent, named Alexander Iden, awaited ſo his time,” &c.

do nothyng?" From this the writer of the old play formed these lines :

O death, if thou will let me live  
But one whole year, I'll give thee as much gold  
As will purchase such another island.

which Shakspeare new-modelled thus :

If thou be'st death, I'll give thee England's treasure,  
Enough to purchase such another island,  
So thou wilt let me live, and feel no pain.

If Shakspeare had been the author of *The first part of the Contention*, &c. finding in his Holinshed the name *Hun*, he would either have preserved it, or softened it to *Hunt*. Working on the old play, where he found the name of *Hum*, which sounded ridiculous to his ear, he changed it to *Hume*. But whoever the original writer of the old play was, having used the name of *Hum*, he must have formed his play on Hall's Chronicle, where *alone* that name is found. Shakspeare therefore having made Holinshed, and not Hall, his guide, could not have been the writer of it.

It may be remarked, that by the alteration of this priest's name he has destroyed a rhyme intended by the author of the original play, where Sir John begins a soliloquy with this jingling line :

" Now, Sir John *Hum*, no word but *mum* :  
" Seal up your lips, for you must silent be."

which Shakspeare has altered thus :

" — But how now, Sir John *Hume* ?  
" Seal up your lips, and give no words but *mum*."

Lines rhiming in the middle and end, similar to that above quoted, are often found in our old English plays, (previous to the time of Shakspeare,) and are generally put into the mouths of priests and friars.

It has already been observed, that in the original play on which *The Second Part of King Henry VI.* is founded, "*Abradas*, the *Macedonian* pirate," is mentioned.

'This

This hero does not appear in Shakspeare's new-modelled play, "*Bargulus*, the strong *Illyrian* pirate," being introduced in his room. *Abradas* is spoken of (as Mr. Steevens has remarked) by Robert Greene, the very person whom I suppose to have been one of the joint authors of the original plays, in a pamphlet, entitled *Penelope's Web*, 1589:—" *Abradas*, the great *Macedonian* pirate, thought every one had a letter of mart that bare sayles in the ocean." Of this pirate or his achievements, however celebrated he may have been, I have not found the slightest trace in any book whatsoever, except that above quoted: a singular circumstance, which appears to me strongly to confirm my hypothesis on the present subject; and to support my interpretation of Greene's words in his *Groatjworth of Witte*, in a former part of the present disquisition.

However this may be, there are certainly very good grounds for believing that *The first part of the Contention of the two houses of York and Lancaster*, &c. and *the True Tragedie of Ricbarde duke of Yorke*, &c. were written by the author or authors of the old *King John*, printed in 1591.

In *The true Tragedie*, &c. we find the following lines:

" Let England be true within itself,

" We need not France, nor any alliance with her."

The first of these lines is found, with a very minute variation, in the old *King John*, where it runs thus:

" Let England live but true within itself,—".

Nor is this the only coincidence. In the deservedly admired scene in which Cardinal Beaufort's death is represented, in the original play, (as well as in Shakspeare's *Second Part of King Henry VI.*) he is called upon to hold up his hand, as a proof of his confidence in God:

" Lord Cardinal,

" If thou diest assured of heavenly blisse,

" Hold up thy hand, and make some sign to us.

[*The Cardinal dies.*

" O see, he dies, and makes no sign at all:

" O God, forgive his soule!"

I quote



I quote from the original play.—It is remarkable that a similar proof is demanded in the old play of *King John* also, when that king is expiring :

“ Then, good my lord, if you forgive them all,  
 “ Lift up your hand, in token you forgive.”

Again :

“ — in token of thy faith,  
 “ And signe thou diest the servant of the Lord,  
 “ Lift up thy hand, that we may witnesse here  
 “ Thou diest the servant of our Saviour Christ.—  
 “ Now joy betide thy soul !”

This circumstance appears to me to add considerable support to my conjecture.]

One point only remains. It may be asked, if *The First Part of King Henry VI.* was not written by Shakspeare, why did Heminge and Condell print it with the rest of his works? The only way that I can account for their having done so, is by supposing, either that their memory at the end of thirty years was not accurate concerning our author's pieces, (as appears indeed evidently from their omitting *Troilus and Cressida*, which was not recollected by them, till the whole of the first folio, and even the table of contents, (which is always the last work of the press,) had been printed; or, that they imagined the insertion of this historical drama was necessary to understanding the two pieces that follow it; or lastly, that, Shakspeare, for the advantage of his own theatre, having written a few lines in *The First Part of King Henry VI.* after his own *Second* and *Third Part* had been played, they conceived this a sufficient warrant for attributing it, along with the others, to him, in the general collection of his works. If Shakspeare was the author of any part of this play, perhaps the second and the following scenes of the fourth act were his; which are for the most part written in rhyme, and appear to me somewhat of a different complexion from the rest of the play. Nor is this the only instance of their proceeding on this ground; for is it possible to conceive that they could have

have any other reason for giving *Titus Andronicus* a place in their edition of Shakspeare's works, than his having written twenty or thirty lines in that piece, or having retouched a few verses of it, if indeed he did so much?

Shakspeare's referring in the Epilogue to *K. Henry V.* which was produced in 1599, to these three parts of *King Henry VI.* of which the first, by whom soever it was written, appears from the testimony of a contemporary to have been exhibited with great applause<sup>7</sup>; and the two latter, having been, as I conceive, eight years before new-modelled and almost re-written by our author, we may be confident were performed with the most brilliant success; his supplicating the favour of the audience to his new play of *King Henry V.* "for the sake" of these old and popular dramas, which were so closely connected with it, and in the composition of which, as they had for many years been exhibited, he had so considerable a share; the connexion between the last scene of *King Henry VI.* and the first scene of *K. Richard III.*; the Shakspearian diction, versification, and figures, by which the *Second* and *Third Part of King Henry VI.* are distinguished; "the easiness of expression and the fluency of numbers," which, it is acknowledged, are found here, and were possessed by no other author of that age; all these circumstances are accounted for by the theory now stated, and all the objections<sup>8</sup> that have been founded upon them, in my apprehension, vanish away.

On the other hand, the entry on the Stationers' books of the old play, entitled *The first part of the Contention of the two houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, &c. without the name of the author; that piece, and *The true Tragedie of Richarde duke of Yorke*, &c. being printed in 1600, anonymously; their being founded on the Chronicle of Hall, who was not Shakspeare's historian, and represented by the servants of Lord Pembroke, by whom

<sup>7</sup> See p. 390, of this Dissertation.

<sup>8</sup> See these several objections stated by Dr. Johnson in the notes at the end of *The Third Part of King Henry VI.*

none of his uncontested dramas were represented ; the colour, diction, and versification of these old plays ; the various circumstances, lines, and speeches, that are found in them, and not in our author's new-modification of them, as published in folio by his original editors ; the resemblances that have been noticed between his other works and such parts of these dramas as are *only* exhibited in their folio edition ; the discordances (in matters of fact) between certain parts of the old plays printed in quarto and Shakspeare's undoubted performances ; the transpositions that he has made in these pieces ; the repetitions, and the peculiar Shakspearian inaccuracies, and phraseology, which may be traced in the folio, and not in the old quarto plays ; these and other circumstances, which have been stated in the foregoing pages, form, when united, such a body of argument and proofs, in support of my hypothesis, as appears to me, (though I will not venture to assert that " the probation bears no hinge nor loop to hang a doubt on,) to lead directly to the door of *truth*."

It is observable that several portions of the English History had been dramatized *before* the time of Shakspeare. Thus, we have *King John* in two parts, by an anonymous writer ; *Edward I.* by George Peele ; *Edward II.* by Christopher Marlowe ; *Edward III.* anonymous ; *Henry IV.* containing the deposition of *Richard II.* and the accession of *Henry* to the crown, anonymous<sup>8</sup> ; *Henry V.* and *Richard III.* both by anonymous authors<sup>9</sup>. Is it not then highly probable, that the *whole* of the story of *Henry VI.* had also been brought upon the scene ? and that the first of the plays now in question, formerly (as I believe) called *The historical play of King Henry VI.* and now named *The First Part of King Henry VI.*, as well as *The first part of the Contention of the two houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, &c. and *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke*, &c. (which three pieces comprehend the entire reign of that king from his birth to his death,) were

<sup>8</sup> See Vol. V. p. 4, n. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Entered on the Stationers' books in 1594.

were the composition of some of the authors, who had produced the historical dramas above enumerated?

In consequence of an hasty and inconsiderate opinion formed by Mr. Pope, without any minute examination of the subject, *K. John* in two parts, printed in 1591, and *The old Taming of a Shrew*, which was entered at Stationers' Hall in 1594, and printed in 1607, passed for half a century for the compositions of Shakspeare. Further inquiries have shown that they were the productions of earlier writers; and perhaps a more profound investigation of this subject than I have been able to make, may hereafter prove decisively, that the *first* of the three *Henries* printed in folio, and both the parts of *The Whole Contention of the two famous houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, as exhibited in quarto, and printed in 1600, ought to be classed in the same predicament with the two old plays above mentioned. For my own part, if it should ever be thought proper to reprint the old dramas on which Shakspeare founded some of his plays, which were published in two volumes a few years ago, I have no doubt that *The first part of the Contention of the two houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, &c. and *The true Tragedie of the duke of Yorke*, &c. should be added to the number.

Gildon somewhere says, that "in a conversation between Shakspeare and Ben Jonson, Ben asked him the reason why he wrote his historical plays." Our author (we are told) replied, that "finding the nation generally very ignorant of history, he wrote them in order to instruct the people in that particular." This anecdote, like many other traditional stories, stands on a very weak foundation; or to speak more justly, it is certainly a fiction. The malignant Ben does indeed, in his *Devil's an Ass*, 1616, sneer at our author's historical pieces, which for twenty years preceding had been in high reputation, and probably were *then* the only historical dramas that had possession of the theatre; but from the list above given, it is clear that Shakspeare was not the *first* who dramatized our old chronicles; and that the principal events of the English History were familiar to the ears of  
his



his audience, before he commenced a writer for the stage\*: though undoubtedly at this day whatever knowledge of our annals is dispersed among the people, is derived from the frequent exhibition of our author's historical plays.

\* This point is established not only by the list referred to, but by a passage in a pamphlet already quoted, entitled *Pierce Pennileffe his Supplication to the Devil*, written by Thomas Nashe, quarto, 1592: "Whereas the afternoone being the eldest time of the day, wherein men that are their owne masters (as gentlemen of the Court, the Innes of court, and the number of captaines and soldiers about London) do wholly bestow themselves upon pleasure, and that pleasure they divide (how virtuously it skilles not,) into gaming, following of harlots, drinking, or *seeing a play*; is it not then better, since of foure extreames all the world cannot keepe them but they will choose one, that they should betake them to the least, which is *Plays*? Nay, what if I prove plays to be no extreame, but a rare exercise of vertue? First, for the *subject* of them; for the most part it is borrowed out of our ENGLISH CHRONICLES, wherein our fore-fathers' valiant actes, that have been long buried in rustie brasse and worme eaten bookes, are revived, and they themselves raised from the grave of oblivion, and brought to plead their aged honours in open presence; than which, what can be a sharper reproofe to these degenerate dayes of ours?"

After an eulogium on the brave Lord Talbot, and on the actor who had personated him in a popular play of that time, "before ten thousand spectators at the least;" (which has already been printed in a former page,) and after observing "what a glorious thing it is to have King Henry the Fifth represented on the stage, leading the French king prisoner, and forcing both him and the Dolphin to swear fealty,"—the writer adds these words:

"In plays, all couzenages, all cunning drifts, over-guiled with outward holinesse, all stratagems of warre, all the canker-wormes that breed in the rust of peace, are most lively anatomized. They shew the ill successe of treason, the fall of hasty climbers, *the wretched end of usurpers, the miserie of civil dissention*, and how just God is evermore in punishing murder. And to prove every one of these allegations, could I propound the circumstances of *this play and that*, if I meant to handle this theame otherwise than *obiter*."

It is highly probable that the words, "*the miserie of civil dissention*," allude to the very plays which are the subjects of the present disquisition, *The first part of the Contention of the two houses*, &c. and *The true Tragedie of Richard duke of Yorke*; as, by "*the wretched end of Usurpers*," and the justice of God in "*punishing murder*," old plays on the subject of *King Richard III.* and that of *Hamlet*, prior to those of Shakspeare, were, I believe, alluded to.

He

He certainly did not consider writing on fables that had already been formed into dramas, as any derogation from his fame; if indeed fame was ever an object of his thoughts. We know that plays on the subjects of *Measure for Measure*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *King John*, *King Richard II.* *King Henry IV.* *King Henry V.* *King Richard III.* *King Lear*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and, I strongly suspect, on those of *Hamlet*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Julius Cæsar*<sup>2</sup>, existed before he commenced a dramattick author; and perhaps in process of time it may be found, that many of the fables of his *other* plays also had been unskilfully treated, and produced upon the stage, by preceding writers.

Such are the only lights that I am able to throw on this very dark subject. The arguments which I have stated have entirely satisfied my own mind; whether they are entitled to bring conviction to the minds of others, I shall not presume to determine. I produce them, however, with the more confidence, as they have the approbation of one who has given such decisive proofs of his taste and knowledge, by ascertaining the extent of *Shakspeare's learning*, that I have no doubt his thoughts on the present question also, will have that weight with the publick to which they are undoubtedly entitled. It is almost unnecessary to add, that I mean my friend Dr. Farmer; who many years ago delivered it as his opinion, that these plays were not written *originally* by Shakspeare.

<sup>2</sup> See *An Attempt to ascertain the order of Shakspeare's Plays*, Vol. I.

T H E E N D.

